

ARTICLE

Contrastive Analysis of Metadiscourse Markers in English and Turkish Death Notices

Dilek Fidan ^{1*} , Esra Aydın ¹ , Gökhan Soyşekerci ² 

¹ Department of Turkish and Social Science Education, Kocaeli University, İzmit 41001, Türkiye

² School of Foreign Languages, Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Antalya 07425, Türkiye

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to compare the discourse structures of death notices written in various cultural contexts, using interpersonal metadiscourse model as a theoretical framework. The distribution of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in death notices published in English and Turkish newspapers was examined to determine how these markers contribute to discourse organization. To achieve this goal, the document analysis method—one of the qualitative research approaches—was employed. The corpus of the study comprises 557 death notice texts (33,618 words; 449 in English and 108 in Turkish), systematically coded and analyzed for interactive and interactional markers under this model. The study found that while the frequency of interactive markers was similar in both cultures, significant cross-cultural differences emerged in the distribution and normalized frequency values (calculated per 1000 words) of interactional markers, which show how the writer influences the reader, were different. Turkish, for instance, did not employ any hedges. Attitude markers were the most commonly used interactional metadiscourse markers in both languages, and the use of euphemistic language use was often preferred to express the event of death. This cross-cultural variation underlines how cultural norms shape linguistic choices in sensitive events like death, thereby demonstrating the sociological embeddedness of discourse. By addressing an understudied genre within a cross-cultural framework, the study contributes to the fields of discourse analysis, genre studies, and intercultural pragmatics.

Keywords: Interactive Discourse Markers; Interactional Discourse Markers; Death Notices; Death Announcement; Newspaper

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Dilek Fidan, Department of Turkish and Social Science Education, Kocaeli University, İzmit 41001, Türkiye; Email: dilek.fidan@kocaeli.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 27 August 2025 | Revised: 25 September 2025 | Accepted: 10 October 2025 | Published Online: 7 November 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.11830>

CITATION

Fidan, D., Aydın, E., Soyşekerci, G., 2025. Contrastive Analysis of Metadiscourse Markers in English and Turkish Death Notices. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(12): 498–515. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.11830>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of death, commonly defined as the cessation of vital functions and the loss of the body's vitality, is described by Hançerlioğlu^[1] (p. 23) as the irreversible end of the vital functions of living beings. Although death is a universal experience, the ways in which individuals and societies respond to it are shaped by social, cultural, and religious frameworks. As such, the announcement of death also differs across cultures, influenced by these frameworks. These differences affect both the linguistic expression (spoken and/or written) and methods of death notification. For instance, according to Örnek^[2] (p. 41), death is traditionally announced in Turkey through several methods: (a) by the relatives of the deceased, (b) by neighbors, (c) by the recitation of the sala in mosques, (d) via municipal or local authority loudspeakers, (e) through newspaper death notices, and (f) by communication tools such as radio, telephone, or telegraph. Building on Örnek's findings, Özgen^[3] (p. 125) notes that, today, (g) news of death is also shared via the internet and social media platforms.

Attitudes toward death offer valuable insights into human behavior and facilitate cross-cultural comparisons (Feifel^[4], p. 128). As Hume^[5] (p. 12) points out, "The obituary, or death notice, has long been a regular feature in the American press. For more than two hundred years newspapers have recorded for the public the lives and the virtues of American citizens."

Death notices can be considered an initial indicator of individual or societal acceptance of death. When such announcement texts are examined, they typically include information about the deceased's familial relationships (e.g., whose mother, father, aunt, etc.), professional background (e.g., the company or companies they worked for, the positions they held), details about the time and location of the funeral ceremony, and the burial site. Ergin^[6] (p. 178) states that within this community-shaped generic frame, death notices display considerable variation such as the amount of space they occupy in the newspaper, the emotional tone adopted, references to the deceased's professional status and accomplishments, religious affiliation, gender, and indications of institutions for donations instead of flowers. According to him, Turkish newspaper death notices can be categorized into four distinct types: (1) Announcement: published to inform others of the death; (2) Condolence and

appreciation: published to express gratitude and solidarity with third parties; (3) Ritual: published in relation to Mawlid ceremonies or other post-death religious gatherings; and (4) Commemoration: published to provide emotional release and remembrance.

In addition to announcing a death, these texts also reflect the relationship between the deceased's family and the wider community. As Ergin^[7] (p. 461) observes, the discourse surrounding death reveals complex intersections of cultural boundaries and social stratification within death notice texts. Consistent with this view, Al-Ali^[8] defines death notices as a text type that provides concise information about the deceased and their relatives, details of the ceremony, and expressions of condolence. Conceptualizing death notices as a genre clarifies how their recurrent purposes and conventions are socially organized: Genres are communicative events arising in specific social contexts, shaped by discourse community members with shared goals (Swales^[9]; Bhatia^[10]; Hyland^[11]). The expectations of that community shape textual design and, in turn, condition metadiscursive choices, since communicative goals are taken into account during text construction (Uzun^[12], p. 134–135).

At the same time, these announcements also serve as a reflection of the relationship between the deceased's family and the wider community. As Ergin^[7] (p. 461) notes, the discourse surrounding death reveals the complex intersections between cultural boundaries and social stratification within death notice texts. Similarly, Al-Ali^[8] defines death notices as a text type that provides concise and clear information regarding the announcement of the deceased or their relatives to family members and acquaintances, details about the ceremony, and expressions of condolences to those who have lost their loved ones.

Death notices vary in numerous ways, including the amount of space they occupy in the newspaper, the emotional tone of the content, the deceased's professional status and accomplishments, religious affiliation, gender, and references to institutions or organizations suggested for donations as an alternative to funeral flowers (Ergin^[6], p. 178).

According to Ergin^[6], newspaper death notices can be categorized into four distinct types: (1) Announcement — published to inform others of the death; (2) Condolence and appreciation — published to express gratitude and solidarity with third parties; (3) Ritual — published in relation to

Mawlid ceremonies or other post-death religious gatherings; and (4) Commemoration — published to provide emotional release and remembrance.

Hume^[5] (p. 12) highlights the communal role of death notices, stating, “Not only can public memory have an impact on obituaries, but death notices of individuals may also influence the collective.” Similarly, Altun^[13] (p. 100) demonstrates how every linguistic and visual element in death notices serves not only to inform about death but also to communicate personal and social meanings related to both the deceased and the broader concept of mortality. He further notes that examining these notices offers “in-depth information about society’s relationship with death, mourning, and commemoration. In this context, uncovering the discourse features of the linguistic elements in death notices enables an analysis of society’s relationship to death. When these features are assessed across different cultural settings, it becomes possible to derive cultural insights from linguistic data. Accordingly, examining death notice texts in two different languages (Turkish and English) from a metadiscourse perspective is expected to reveal cultural differences and similarities. Building on discourse analytical and genre studies that offer insights into how linguistic choices are shaped by cultural and sociological factors, this study focuses on death notices, a relatively understudied genre, and interprets them through the lens of cultural variation. Looking at the studies conducted on this topic in the literature (Ergin^[14]; Borde^[15], 2015; Aliakbari & Tarlani-Aliabadi^[16]; Facchinetti^[17]; Landert^[18]; Laurila^[19]), although these studies have examined the linguistic features of death notices, to the best of our knowledge, no study has been found in the literature comparing death notices from two different cultures within the framework of metadiscourse markers. Therefore, by approaching cross-cultural comparative discourse analysis from a metadiscursive standpoint, the present study provides a new contribution to the literature.

In light of these considerations, this study comparatively explores the discourse structures of death notices produced in different cultural contexts, utilizing Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse model as a theoretical framework to identify and compare metadiscourse strategies in English and Turkish death notices. Within this framework, the study aims to compare the discourse structures of death notice texts produced in different cultural settings. In line with this aim, the next

section will present in detail the metadiscourse model that constitutes the study’s theoretical framework and explain its core conceptual components.

2. Metadiscourse Models and Metadiscourse Markers

The term *metadiscourse* was first introduced by Zellig Harris in 1959 (Hyland^[20], p. 3), and since then, various scholars have examined it in the literature, offering different classifications. The concept allows researchers to investigate which linguistic elements a speaker or writer uses to accomplish communicative goals such as conveying information implicitly, including or excluding the audience from the discourse community, or substantiating claims. In other words, metadiscourse refers to the linguistic choices a text producer makes based on how they want their message to be interpreted by readers or listeners. Within this framework, metadiscourse is generally defined as the features that explicitly signal either the discourse-organizing function of the text or the writer’s stance toward the content or the audience (Hyland^[21], p. 438). Metadiscourse markers can thus be seen as rhetorical tools used by the writer to influence the audience.

Several classification systems of metadiscourse markers exist in the literature, including those by Lautamatti^[22], Williams^[23], Crismore^[24,25], Crismore et al.^[26], Vande Kopple^[27], Hyland^[21], Hyland and Tse^[28], Hyland^[20], and Ädel^[29]. Among these, Hyland’s^[20] model stands out as the most comprehensive, developed in response to what he considered misinterpretations of the language’s metafunctions in earlier frameworks. The current study is based on this model, which is presented in **Table 1**.

With interactive metadiscourse markers, the author organizes the propositional content of the text by taking into account the characteristics of the target audience, such as age, gender, background knowledge, and socio-cultural status. The aim is to ensure coherence and make the message more persuasive. Hyland^[20] (p. 52) states that interactive markers reflect the author’s attitude toward both the content and the reader, helping to focus the reader’s attention, persuade them, and guide their interpretation of the message. These explanations show that through conscious linguistic choices, the writer can influence the audience in ways that may lead them

to act or not act, choose or not choose, or accept or reject certain ideas. This category consists of five subcategories: *transitions*, *frame markers*, *endophoric markers*, *evidentials*, and *code glosses* as shown in **Table 1**. These markers help the writer structure the discourse and guide the reader through the logical flow of the text (Hyland^[20], p. 49).

In addition to interactive markers, Hyland^[20] (p. 54) also identifies a second main category: interactional metadis-

course markers. These markers operate at the interpersonal level of discourse, allowing the writer to convey personal attitudes, evaluations, and involvement. In this way, the writer directly engages with the reader and shares their stance toward the content. Interactional markers are classified into five subcategories as well: *hedges*, *boosters*, *attitude markers*, *self-mentions*, and *engagement markers*, as shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Hyland's^[20] Metadiscourse Model.

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive	Helps to Guide the Reader Through the Text	Resources
Transitions	express relations between main clauses	in addition; but; thus; and
Frame Markers	refer to discourse acts, sequence or stages	finally; to conclude; my purpose is
Endophoric Markers	refer to information in other parts of the texts	noted above; see fig; in section 2
Evidentials	refer to information from other texts	according to x; z states
Code Glosses	elaborate propositional meanings	namely; e.g; such as; in other words
Interactional	Involves the Reader in the Text	Resources
Hedges	withhold commitment and open dialogue	might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	emphasize certainty or close dialogue	in fact; definitely; it is clear that
Attitude Markers	express writer's attitude to proposition	unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
Self Mentions	explicit reference to author(s)	I; we; my; me; our
Engagement Markers	explicitly build relationship with reader	consider; note; you can see that

Since language reflects the values and social structures of different communities, it is expected that the metadiscourse features of death notices will vary across languages. Although some studies (Salahshour^[30], 2017; Murrell et al.^[31]) have examined death notices separately, there is a lack of comparative research focusing on English and Turkish texts from a metadiscourse perspective. To address this gap, this study applies Hyland's^[20] model to investigate whether English and Turkish death notices written, although belonging to the same genre, differ in their use of metadiscourse markers. For this purpose, the distribution of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in death notice texts published in English and Turkish newspapers is analyzed to understand how these markers contribute to discourse organization.

3. Materials and Methods

In this study, which analyzes death notices published in English and Turkish newspapers in terms of metadiscourse markers, the document analysis method—one of the qualitative research approaches—was employed. Within this framework, a corpus consisting of 557 death notices (449

in English and 108 in Turkish) in both English and Turkish was compiled and examined. Although the English dataset (449 notices) is larger than the Turkish dataset (108 notices), this disparity reflects the natural distribution of death notices across the selected newspapers rather than a methodological limitation. To ensure comparability, the analysis was based on normalized frequency values (calculated per 1000 words) instead of raw counts. This procedure made it possible to account for corpus length differences and to identify relative distributional patterns of metadiscourse markers across the two languages. As stated in Hyland^[32], utilizing such a comprehensive corpus makes it possible to observe a wide range of naturally occurring examples of the relevant linguistic features, thereby reflecting the actual language practices of the respective discourse communities.

The population of the study consists of death notices published in daily newspapers in Turkey and the UK. The following procedure was adopted to determine the English and Turkish samples. To construct the Turkish corpus, 20 currently active newspapers were selected based on the records of the Turkish Press-Advertisement Institution (Basın İlan Kurumu). These newspapers are listed in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Daily Newspapers Published in Turkey.

Daily Newspapers in Turkey			
1. Açık Mert Korkusuz	6. Doğru Haber	11. Milat	16. Türkgün
2. Akşam	7. Dünya	12. Milli Gazete	17. Türkiye
3. Analiz	8. Bir Gün	13. Milliyet	18. Yeni Akit
4. Aydınlık	9. Hürriyet	14. Posta	19. Yeni Birlik
5. Cumhuriyet	10. Karar	15. Sözcü	20. Yeni Şafak

Newspapers listed by the Turkish Press-Advertisement Institution were scanned, and death notices from three widely circulated and popularly read dailies, Hürriyet, Sabah, and Sözcü, were selected for inclusion in the study's database, as these newspapers regularly publish such announcements. In this context, death notices published in Hürriyet, Sabah, and Sözcü between 1–20 January 2025 were analyzed. The decision to limit the corpus (both for Turkish and English) to three weeks was a deliberate methodological choice. By selecting a recent, short, clearly defined timeframe, the study ensures synchronic comparability across languages and minimizes potential seasonal or situational variation in death notice publication. **Table 3** presents the distribution of these notices across the selected newspapers. Borde^[15], in his diachronic study of death notices, notes that the linguistic presentation of such texts has undergone significant change over time. Therefore, in order to capture the current linguistic features and rhetorical tendencies of death notice writing,

a narrowly defined time frame was selected for this study.

To address the research questions, a total of 108 Turkish death notices were examined in terms of metadiscourse markers. Condolence and commemoration notices were excluded from the Turkish dataset. As for the English corpus, the death notices were collected from daily newspapers published in UK. Although the initial plan included American newspapers as well, access to the online archives of U.S. newspapers dated between January 1–20, 2025, was not possible due to registration requirements, such as a U.S.-based postal code and phone number, which could not be provided by researchers residing outside the country. Additionally, although American biographical obituaries were identified, they were excluded from the study because they differ significantly in structure and genre from the types of notices commonly published in Turkey. Therefore, English death notices published in the United Kingdom were selected for the analysis. **Table 4** presents the list of these newspapers.

Table 3. Daily Newspapers Included in the Turkish Corpus.

Daily Newspapers Included in the Turkish Corpus	
Newspaper	Number of Death Notices
1. Hürriyet	41
2. Sabah	14
3. Sözcü	53
TOTAL	108

Table 4. Daily Newspapers Published in the UK.

Daily Newspaper in the UK	
1. The Times	6. Daily Mail
2. The Daily Telegraph	7. Daily Express
3. The i Paper	8. Daily Mirror
4. The Guardian	9. Daily Star
5. The Sun	10. Morning Star

Among the ten newspapers identified in the UK, The Times and The Daily Telegraph were selected as the primary sources for the English dataset, as they regularly publish

death notices. A total of 449 death notices retrieved from these two newspapers formed the English corpus of the study. The distribution of these notices across the newspapers is

presented in **Table 5**.

The English and Turkish death notices were transferred to Microsoft Word, and the Turkish corpus was manually analyzed by the researchers. For the English corpus, a total of 449 texts were compiled into an electronic database and processed using the WordPilot2000 software^[33]. This tool was employed to identify 250 lexical items previously identified

as potential metadiscourse markers in studies by Bondi^[34], Biber et al.^[35], and Hyland^[20,36,37]. These texts were independently analyzed and compared by the researchers. The reason for manually analyzing the corpus of Turkish texts is that there were no previous studies classifying Turkish metadiscourse markers like the ones for English in WordPilot 2000 software.

Table 5. Daily Newspapers Included in the English Corpus.

Daily Newspapers Included in the English Corpus	
Newspaper	Number of Death Notices
1. The Times	201
2. The Daily Telegraph	248
TOTAL	449

To ensure reliability, 10% of the samples from both English and Turkish texts were evaluated by two independent experts in the field. Interrater reliability was calculated to ensure coding consistency. In cases where discrepancies existed between raters, disagreements were resolved through discussion and mutual consensus. If consensus could not be reached, a third expert reviewed the item to determine the final coding decision. This procedure enhanced both reliability and transparency of metadiscourse marker annotation. The interrater reliability was calculated to be above 80%, specifically 92% for English and 84% for Turkish. The results were categorized based on the two main dimensions of

Hyland's^[20] metadiscourse model and discussed separately with regard to their distribution in each cultural context. The findings of the study are presented in the following section.

4. Findings

In this study, which aims to compare death notices in English and Turkish from a discursive perspective, the use of metadiscourse markers has been revealed. In this context, the frequencies of interactive metadiscourse markers (MDM) in death notices in daily newspapers published in the UK and Turkey are shown in **Table 6**.

Table 6. Frequencies of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in English and Turkish Newspapers.

Interactive MDMs (English)	Number of MDMs	Number of MDMs Per 1000 Words	Interactive MDMs (Turkish)	Number of MDMs	Number of MDMs Per 1000 Words
Transitions	1059	40	Transitions	394	55.26
Frame Markers	18	0.68	Frame Markers	77	10.80
Endophoric Markers	410	15.47	Endophoric Markers	351	49.22
Evidentials	2	0.07	Evidentials	0	0
Code Glosses	1341	50.62	Code Glosses	977	137.03
TOTAL	2830	106.84	TOTAL	1799	252.31

According to **Table 6**, the total number of interactive metadiscourse markers in English death notices is 2830, corresponding to a frequency of 106.84 per 1000 words. In contrast, Turkish death notices contain a total of 1799 markers, with a significantly higher frequency of 252.31 per 1000 words. This indicates that Turkish texts use these markers at about 2.4 times the rate found in English texts.

The table also reveals that code glosses appear at a frequency of 50.62 per 1000 words in English, whereas in Turkish, they occur 137.03 times per 1000 words. The second most frequent category, transitions, appears 40 times per 1000 words in English and 55.26 times in Turkish. Endophoric markers occur 15.47 times per 1000 words in English compared to 49.22 in Turkish. Frame markers show a

frequency of 0.68 per 1000 words in English and 10.80 in Turkish. Finally, evidentials are used only 0.07 times per 1000 words in English and are entirely absent in the Turkish corpus.

Notably, although Turkish death notices employ interactive metadiscourse markers at more than double the frequency found in English, the relative order of marker types in terms of usage remains consistent across both languages. The following section presents examples of these markers from the texts forming the database, listed in the same order as **Table 6**.

(1) She leaves her daughter, two grandchildren **and** two great-grandchildren, **but** rejoins her husband, Alexander (The Times)

In example (1), the conjunctions “and” and “but” are classified as transitions within Hyland’s^[20] model of interactive metadiscourse. The conjunction and functions to link two parallel elements, grandchildren and great-grandchildren, “but” introduces a contrast between the family members left behind and the spouse with whom the deceased is now reunited. These markers clarify the logical relationship between ideas, enhance textual coherence, and support reader comprehension. Therefore, they are considered part of the textual organizational features of metadiscourse.

(2) (TR) Ailesi çiçek gönderilmesi yerine Türk Eğitim Vakfı, Atatürkçü Düşünce Derneği **veya** LÖSEV’e bağış yapılması ailenin ricasıdır. (Sözcü)

(EN) The family requests that, instead of sending flowers, donations be made to the Turkish Education Foundation, the Association of Kemalist Thought **or** LÖSEV.

The conjunction “or” (Tr. “veya”) in example (2) links three institutional options presented as equally valid, without prioritizing one over the others. Functioning at the discourse level, or does more than indicate alternatives; it distributes the interpretive weight across the options, thereby enabling the suggested action (i.e., making a donation) to be fulfilled through multiple possible avenues. This use of “or” frames the message as an open-ended invitation rather than a singular directive. In this way, it operates as a transition that not only maintains textual cohesion but also facilitates the reader’s decision-making process within the structure of the

death notice.

(3) She is **now** free to return to her beloved Ireland. (The Times)

In example (3), the metadiscourse marker “now” signals the transition to a new temporal stage in the narrative; specifically, the period following death; and draws the reader’s attention to this shift in time. Unlike the earlier part of the discourse, which refers to the illness phase, “now” marks the beginning of a different discursive segment. Within this context, “now” serves to delineate the structural boundaries between events, clarify the stages of the narrative, and establish a temporal orientation. As such, “now” operates as a frame marker by organizing the schematic structure of the text and guiding the reader through the temporal progression of the discourse.

(4) (TR) Cenazesi 18 Ocak 2025 günü Zincirlikuyu Camii’nde kılınacak ikinci namazının **takiben** Feriköy Aile Mezarlığı’nda toprağa verilecektir. (Sözcü)

(EN) The funeral will be held at Zincirlikuyu Mosque on January 18, 2025, and the burial will take place at Feriköy Family Cemetery **following** the afternoon prayer.

In example (4), the word “following” (Tr. “takiben”) functions as a frame marker within Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse model. It signals a temporal link between two sequential events, indicating that the burial will take place immediately after the funeral prayer. In doing so, it helps establish chronological order and guides the reader through the progression of discourse. While “following” operates as a temporal adverb on the surface, its broader role is to structure the flow of information by marking the sequence of actions. Therefore, elements like “following”, which direct the progression of the narrative and connect successive components, can be classified as frame markers.

(5) Leaving behind **his** wife Cilla, children Nicollette and Alexander, stepdaughters Lucy and Fiona, and 8 grandchildren. (The Daily Telegraph)

In Example (5), the pronoun “his” functions as an endophoric marker within the framework of Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse theory. It clearly refers back to the deceased

individual mentioned earlier in the text. Such referential expressions contribute to discourse cohesion by creating semantic links between different parts of the text. As Hyland^[20] explains, endophoric markers serve to maintain textual coherence and help readers navigate through the discourse by pointing to earlier or forthcoming elements. In this case, “his” reinforces the continuity of the subject’s identity and anchors new information to previously established content, thereby preventing any semantic disconnect in the progression of the discourse.

(6) (TR) **Merhumun** cenazesi 18 Ocak 2025 Cumartesi günü öğle namazının ardından Levent Afet Yolal Camii’nden alınarak toprağa verilecektir. (Sözcü)

(EN) The funeral of **the deceased** will be held on Saturday, January 18, 2025, and following the midday prayer, it will proceed from Levent Afet Yolal Mosque to the burial site.

In example (6), the term “deceased” (Tr. “merhum”) does not introduce external information into the discourse; rather, it refers back to an individual already mentioned or implied in the preceding lines. This usage functions to reorient the reader’s attention toward the same subject, thereby forming a cohesive semantic chain within the text. As a result, the narrative maintains its continuity, and the referent’s identity remains intact in the reader’s mental representation. In this context, the “deceased” does not serve an introductory role; instead, it re-encodes a known and contextually established figure and should therefore be classified as an endophoric marker.

(7) **Slán abhaile.** (The Times)

In example (7), the phrase “Slán abhaile” refers not to the narrator’s own expression, but to an external cultural source rooted in collective memory. This traditional farewell in Irish Gaelic, translating to “safe return” or “go home in peace,” functions as a culturally embedded citation rather than a personal evaluative remark. Within Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse framework, such use qualifies as an evidential, as it draws upon a shared linguistic and cultural repertoire to reinforce the writer’s message. By incorporating this culturally authoritative expression, the writer lends credibility to the discourse through reference to a socially recognized tradition rather than personal assertion.

(8) **“Monro attracted affection.”** (The Daily Telegraph)

In Example (8), the sentence “Monro attracted affection” does not reflect a direct observation or the personal evaluation of the writer. Rather, it conveys a widely shared perception of Monro that has been collectively expressed by those around him, whether individuals, communities, or within a broader social context. The phrase is not presented as the writer’s original opinion, but as a representation of commonly held impressions attributed to the deceased. In this sense, such expressions fall under the category of evidentials in Hyland’s^[20] model, as the information is derived not from the writer’s firsthand experience but from indirect observations or social attitudes reported by others. Since no evidential markers were found in the Turkish corpus, Examples (7) and (8) both illustrate evidential usage exclusively from English death notices.

(9) Seventh child and fourth son of Reginald and Dorothy Allott (**née Dobson**). (The Times)

In Example (9), the phrase “née Dobson” provides additional explanatory information by indicating Dorothy Allott’s maiden name. Such parenthetical insertions are categorized as code glosses in Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse model, as they are used to clarify or elaborate on a particular element in the text, in this case, a proper noun. The expression “née Dobson” expands the meaning of the sentence by helping the reader more clearly identify the individual being referenced. It thus serves to enhance the reader’s understanding by offering supplementary clarification.

(10) (TR) **Kadriye Erduran ve Behçet Sabit Erduran’ın kızı, Cabiri Ailesi, Meyla Cabiri ve Erol Erduran’ın kuzeni**, Türk sanat dünyasının gururu, Cumhuriyetimizin önde gelen kadın sanatçılarından, **Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devlet Sanatçısı** AYL A ERDURAN 7 Ocak 2025 tarihinde Hakk’ın rahmetine kavuşmuştur. (Hürriyet)

(EN) AYL A ERDURAN, the daughter of **Kadriye Erduran** and **Behçet Sabit Erduran**, cousin of the **Cabiri Family**, **Meyla Cabiri**, and **Erol Erduran**; a source of pride for the Turkish art world, one of the leading female artists of our Republic, and **a State Artist of**

the Republic of Turkey, passed away on January 7, 2025.

In Example (10), the proper names included in the sentence serve as explanatory elements that clarify the identity of the main subject, Ayla Erduran. These references are incorporated into the text to help the reader understand who she is and to which family and social context she belongs. Therefore, in line with Hyland's^[20] metadiscourse theory, they can be categorized as code glosses. Code glosses are linguistic devices used to clarify the meaning of specific elements in a text, support the reader's comprehension, and reinforce contextual understanding. In this instance, the inclusion of family members' names and surnames provides biographical background information that situates Ayla Erduran within her familial and social sphere. Additionally, titles such as "State Artist of the Republic of Turkey" function as descriptive clarifications that shape the reader's perception of the subject. As these expressions enhance the reader's ability to interpret the reference more precisely and fully, they function as code glosses.

In line with the aim of the study, **Table 7** presents the frequencies of interactional metadiscourse markers found in death notices published in daily newspapers in the UK and

Turkey.

The frequency of interactional metadiscourse markers identified in the English and Turkish death notice corpus is 126.36 per 1000 words in Turkish and 94.04 per 1000 words in English. While **Table 6** previously demonstrated that the total number of interactive metadiscourse markers was higher in English death notices (2830) than in Turkish ones (1799), the relative frequency per 1000 words was considerably higher in Turkish (252.31) than in English (106.84). A similar distributional pattern is observed in the case of interactional markers: although the absolute number is again greater in English (2491 vs. 901), the frequency per 1000 words is higher in Turkish (126.36 vs. 94.04). Therefore, the term higher density refers not to the overall number of markers, but to their proportional occurrence within the corpus. In both languages, attitude markers emerge as the most frequently used subcategory of interactional markers. Their frequency in Turkish texts is 68.16 per 1000 words, whereas in English, it is 43.5 per 1000 words. In the Turkish corpus, attitude markers are followed by self-mentions (38.14), engagement markers (11.08), and boosters (8.97). Notably, hedges, classified as avoidance markers, were not found in any of the Turkish death notices analyzed.

Table 7. Frequencies of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in English and Turkish Death Notices.

Interactional MDMs (English)	Number of MDMs	Number of MDMs Per 1000 Words	Interactional MDMs (Turkish)	Number of MDMs	Number of MDMs Per 1000 Words
Hedges	67	2.53	Hedges	0	0
Boosters	403	15.21	Boosters	64	8.97
Attitude Markers	1152	43.5	Attitude Markers	486	68.16
Self-Mentions	13	0.49	Self-Mentions	272	38.14
Engagement Markers	856	32.31	Engagement Markers	79	11.08
TOTAL	2491	94.04	TOTAL	901	126.36

In contrast, the English corpus shows the following distribution after attitude markers: engagement markers (32.31), boosters (15.21), hedges (2.53), and self-mentions (0.49). Thus, while attitude markers are the most common interactional devices in both languages, the ordering of the remaining categories differs significantly.

The following section presents examples of interactional metadiscourse markers identified in both English and Turkish death notices, arranged according to the categories listed in **Table 7**.

(11) No flowers, but donations, **if desired**, to

St Mungo's. (The Times)

In Example (11), the phrase "if desired" functions as a hedging device within Hyland's^[20] metadiscourse framework. This expression allows the writer or the individual drafting the announcement to reduce rhetorical imposition by framing the suggestion as an optional action rather than issuing a direct request. It acknowledges the possibility that the reader may choose not to act upon the suggestion, thereby avoiding an assertive or directive tone. Given the emotionally sensitive nature of the context, "if desired" serves to soften the appeal for donations and mitigates the sense of

obligation. Although a suggestion is made, its forcefulness is deliberately diminished. As Hyland^[20] explains, hedging strategies are used to intentionally obscure or downplay the writer's epistemic stance or directives within the discourse. Accordingly, "if desired" should be classified as a hedge, as it minimizes authorial responsibility and introduces flexibility into the communicative act by presenting the suggestion as optional rather than prescriptive.

(12) These **may be given** via the offertory box
c/o the funeral director or online at: <https://sheila-evans-1931-2025.muchloved.com/>
(The Daily Telegraph)

In example (12), the phrase "may be given" does not convey a sense of obligation but rather emphasizes possibility, thereby limiting the writer's linguistic responsibility. The suggested behavior is framed as a feasible option rather than as a directive or expectation. As Hyland^[20] explains in his metadiscourse theory, such expressions fall under the category of hedges, as they reflect a deliberate avoidance of expressing absolute certainty or commitment to a proposition. The modal verb "may" here signals that the act of giving is optional and allows for a broad range of reader response, avoiding any imposition or social pressure. This rhetorical strategy is particularly common in contexts involving emotionally sensitive topics, where the narrator respects the reader's autonomy and refrains from assertive guidance. Since no instances of hedging were observed in the Turkish death notices, Examples (11) and (12) both illustrate hedging strategies as found in English texts.

(13) **Much** loved and missed wife of Joseph,
mother of Andrew and Ian, and grandmother
of JJ and Albert. (The Daily Telegraph)

In example (13), the term "much" serves as a linguistic intensifier that amplifies the emotional weight of the verb "loved". Within Hyland's^[20] metadiscourse framework, this expression is categorized as a booster, as it reflects the writer's strong commitment to the propositional content. Positioned before an affectively loaded verb, much underscores that the sentiment being conveyed; love is not moderate or casual but rather profound and deeply felt. This heightened emphasis contributes to the overall persuasive and affective power of the discourse, aiming to elicit a more emotional response from the reader. By employing a booster such as

"much", the writer signals certainty and alignment with the intensity of the emotion being described, thereby reinforcing the interpersonal dimension of the death notice.

(14) (TR) Merhuma Allah'tan rahmet, **tüm** sevelerine ve çalışma arkadaşlarımıza sabır dileriz. (Hürriyet)
(EN) We wish God's mercy upon the deceased and extend our condolences and patience to **all** his loved ones and colleagues.

In example (14), the word "all" (Tr. "tüm") amplifies the scope of the addressed group, thereby enhancing the emotional resonance of the message. Rather than simply referring to "loved ones," the use of "all" introduces a sense of total inclusion, leaving no member of the group unacknowledged. This strategic lexical choice aligns with the category of boosters in Hyland's^[20] metadiscourse framework, as it serves to intensify the emotional tone and increase the persuasive force of the statement. By emphasizing the breadth of those affected by the loss, the term "all" contributes to a heightened sense of communal mourning. Thus, beyond its numerical implication, "all" functions as a deliberate rhetorical device designed to magnify the impact of the sentiment conveyed and can be classified as a booster for its role in reinforcing the emotional and expressive power of the discourse.

(15) Charles **sadly** passed away from bowel cancer on 22nd December 2024. (The Times)

In example (15), the expression "sadly" does more than merely convey the news of a death; it also communicates the emotional weight that accompanies this announcement, thereby functioning as an attitude marker in Hyland's^[20] metadiscourse model. Rather than reflecting a factual evaluation of the information itself, the term offers an emotional framing of how the information is presented. Given that death is, in itself, an objective reality, the insertion of "sadly" disrupts this objectivity by incorporating the narrator's sorrowful psychological state into the discourse. This lexical choice enables the reader to perceive not only the information being conveyed but also the emotional tone that surrounds it. Thus, "sadly" signals the narrator's affective stance and fosters a shared emotional experience between writer and reader.

(16) (TR) **Değerli** meslektaşımız TUNCER

ERTAS 7 Ocak 2025 Salı günü vefat etmiştir.
(Sabah)

(EN) Our **esteemed** colleague TUNCER ERTAS passed away on Tuesday, January 7, 2025.

In example (16), the adjective “esteemed” (Tr. “değerli”) is a judgmental expression that positions the individual not merely as a colleague but as someone respected and valued. Such evaluative language containing subjective stance falls under the category of attitude markers in Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse model, as it conveys the author’s emotional or value-based perspective. The adjective does more than describe; it adds depth of meaning and emotional weight to the death notice, simultaneously inviting the reader to adopt a similar framework of respect. When combined with an objective expression like “passed away,” value-laden terms like “esteemed” go beyond mere information delivery and emotionally involve the writer in the discourse.

(17) With great sadness, **we** announce the death of Jennifer “Jenny” Elizabeth Randerson (née Sinclair) on 4th January 2025, aged 76. (The Times)

In Example (17), the pronoun “we” is a self-referential expression through which the speaker(s) directly include themselves within the discourse. As such, it is categorized as a self-mention in Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse model. The term “we” refers to the announcer(s), who, although unnamed, take an active role in the construction of the message. In death notices, this pronoun is often used by family members, close relatives, or institutional representatives who bear emotional and social responsibility for the announcement. This usage personalizes the discourse, positioning the author(s) not as distant observers but as emotionally involved participants. It indicates that the death notice is not merely a formal statement, but a message grounded in human relationships. The phrase “we announce” not only conveys information but also carries the emotional and social weight of delivering such news. Therefore, similar to any pronoun that explicitly brings the author into the discourse, “we” functions as an example of a self-mention.

(18) (TR) **Başımız** sağ olsun. (Sabah)
(EN) **Our** condolences.

In example (18), the Turkish bound morpheme {-ImIz}

(En. 1PL possessive) in the phrase “Başımız sağ olsun” (En. “our condolences”) directly incorporates the speaker into the text. The subject of the utterance is not only the source of the message but also its emotional and social addressee. By using the first-person plural suffix, the announcer explicitly represents themselves or the group they speak for within the discourse. Thus, the narrator does more than extend sympathy to an external audience; they include themselves in the mourning process, positioning themselves as both producer and participant in the message. This self-involvement signals that the statement is not anonymous but is owned by a distinct speaker identity. Consequently, “Başımız sağ olsun” functions as a self-mention, linguistically foregrounding the narrator’s presence in the text.

(19) Funeral Service **at St Mary's Church, Church Lane, South Wootton, King's Lynn, Norfolk, at 12 noon on Friday 31st January, 2025.** (The Daily Telegraph)

In example (19), the detailed location information does more than convey factual data; it implicitly invites the reader to take action. In this respect, it functions as an engagement marker in Hyland’s^[20] metadiscourse framework. Engagement markers draw the reader into the discourse, shifting them from passive recipients to potential participants in the communicative act. Here, the precise address not only answers the “where” question but also serves as a subtle yet powerful prompt, especially for relatives, friends, and acquaintances expected to attend the ceremony and guides them toward concrete involvement in the event.

(20) (TR) Cenazesi 12 Ocak Pazar günü (yarın) Zincirlikuyu Camii’nde kılınacak öğle namazının ardından **Zincirlikuyu Mezarlığı Aile Kabristanı**’na defnedilecektir. (Sabah)
(EN) The funeral will take place tomorrow, Sunday, 12 January, at Zincirlikuyu Mosque and, following the midday prayer, the deceased will be interred **in the family plot at Zincirlikuyu Cemetery.**

In Example (20), the Turkish specification “in the family plot at Zincirlikuyu Cemetery” operates, much like the previous English example, as a discourse cue that creates a concrete spatial target in the reader’s mind and implicitly calls for physical attendance. By presenting the address

explicitly, the notice moves its audience out of a passive role and positions them as potential participants who can act on the information provided. Consequently, this element functions as an engagement marker, prompting involvement rather than merely conveying location.

5. Discussion

This study, drawing on Hyland's^[20] model of metadiscourse markers, aims to identify the preferred discourse structures in Turkish and English death notices and to conduct a cross-cultural comparison at the discourse level. It analyzes a dataset comprising 557 texts (33,618 words) published over 20 days in newspapers in the United Kingdom and Turkey.

It is evident that interactive metadiscourse markers occur more frequently than interactional markers in death notices in both languages. Within Hyland's^[20] framework, interactive markers help readers through the text in a linear and uniform manner, ensuring that everyone arrives at the same interpretation. In this regard, although cultural differences exist, the finding that interactive markers are more frequent than interactional markers in both languages is congruent with the theory (English: 106.84 and Turkish: 252.31). This is likely because, despite the genre's inherent emotional tenor, the primary purpose of death notices is informational; the announcer seeks to provide detailed, explicit information about the deceased's life, relationships, and funeral, and to guarantee full comprehension. This pattern also aligns with prior research (Hyland^[20]; Kuhi et al.^[38]; Zali, et al.^[39]; Binmahboob^[40]; Kirişçi & Duruk^[41]; Soyşekerci^[42]) on other genres across different cultures. Although the study's focus on a single genre and its limited sample size preclude drawing generalizable conclusions about the frequency of interactive markers, the fact that research on informative texts in various languages likewise reports higher rates of interactive markers points to a broadly applicable theoretical pattern. In other words, across studies of texts that prioritize the transmission of information, interactive markers are used more frequently than interactional markers; the emergence of the same pattern in the present analysis of death notices further corroborates the influence of the metadiscourse model across genres.

While interactive markers occur more frequently than interactional markers in both cultures, when the results across

the two languages are considered, interactive markers are also used more frequently in Turkish death notices than in English ones. This pattern may be attributed to the unequal number of texts obtained; however, since a standardized rate (frequency per 1000 words) was used for both languages, it can also be interpreted in terms of typological differences between the languages or broader cultural variation. As further evidence, when the literature is examined from the perspective of text genres, by contrast, studies of narrative genres (Sadeghi & Esmaili^[43]; Al-jazrawi & Al-jazrawi^[44,45]; Soyşekerci^[42]; İşeri et al.^[46]) reveal the opposite trend relative to informative genres: Interactional markers outnumber interactive metadiscourse markers. In other words, in genres where narration and reader engagement take precedence, the interactional function, through which writers address and influence readers-naturally outweighs the interactive function that merely organizes information.

In both languages, code glosses are the most frequently used interactive metadiscourse markers. Since code glosses help readers accurately interpret textual units (Hyland^[20]) and provide supplementary information on the topic (Bondi^[47], p. 2), their prevalence indicates that death notices extensively elaborate on the information presented, thereby making the text comprehensible and accessible to a wider audience. This tendency stems from the informative function of death notices, which explicitly state the deceased's achievements, relationships, previous positions, and similar details.

In a text, transitions help readers recognize how the author organizes the discourse and how individual units are linked (Hyland^[20]). Accordingly, transitions rank as the second most frequent interactive metadiscourse markers, after code glosses, in both languages, highlighting the need for clear structure and accurate information transfer in death notices. Studies on academic writing (Khedri, et al.^[48], 2013; Özdemir & Longo^[49]; Wang & Zhang^[50]; Mansouri, et al.^[51]; Şen^[52]; Soyşekerci^[42]; Dağ-Tarcan^[53]; Şen^[52,54]; Soyşekerci et al.^[55]; Güçlü^[56]) consistently identify transitions as the most frequent interactive markers. The same pattern is reported for narrative texts (Sadeghi & Esmaili^[43]; Ahangari & Kazemi^[57]; Al-jazrawi & Al-jazrawi^[45]; Esmacili^[58]; Hidayah^[59]; Rahmawati^[60]; Putri et al.^[61]; Soyşekerci^[42]). This issue can be explained by genre-specific features of death notices.

In both languages, the third most frequent interactive metadiscourse markers are endophoric markers. These units serve as reminders or signals that point to information mentioned earlier or that will be mentioned later, thereby maintaining textual coherence and cohesion (Hyland^[20]). In this context, in Turkish and English death notices alike, such endophoric references commonly appear when introducing the deceased, often alluding to previously deceased relatives, in line with the definition of endophoric markers in the metadiscourse model.

Frame markers constitute the fourth most frequent interactive metadiscourse markers in texts in both languages. In the literature, studies of research articles (Soyşekerci^[42]; Khajavy et al.^[62]; Ghahremani-Mina & Bria^[63]) identify frame markers as the second most common interactive markers, whereas investigations of narrative texts (Putri et al.^[61]; Esmacili^[58]) find them to be the least frequent. This contrast again underscores genre-based variation: The stylistic template of death notices plays a decisive role. Because information in these notices is presented in a fixed sequence and within a conventionalized newspaper layout (Borde^[15]), the need for extensive framing is limited. At the same time, this may vary not only by genre but also by the length of texts within a genre or by subgenres. In this regard, death notices are typically shorter than other informative genres and convey information directly, which further restricts the use of frame markers.

In both languages, evidentials are the least frequent interactive metadiscourse markers; they do not occur at all in Turkish death notices and, while in English, they appear only 0.07 times per 1000 words. Because the content of death notices is grounded in personal or family information, external sources are seldom cited, and attribution is generally unnecessary. In the study's findings, evidentials constitute the least frequently used interactive marker; likewise, prior research also identifies evidentials as among the least frequent markers. These findings accord with studies of scientific prose (Farahani & Mohemmed^[64]; Soyşekerci^[42]), narrative texts (Sadeghi & Esmaili^[43]; Al-jazrawi & Al-jazrawi^[44]), non-fiction and its translations (Herriman^[65]), novels (Ahangari & Kazemi^[57]; Hamad & Kareem^[66]), and other genre-focused research records (Hidayah^[59]; Putri et al.^[61]; Rahmawati^[60]). Considered specifically in terms of the death notice genre, the primary function of the text is

to make a direct announcement; accordingly, only brief and explicit event-related information is provided, and there is no need to cite other texts unless strictly required. As a genre, death notices announce a death, inform readers, and invite them to attend the funeral. They therefore rely heavily on formulaic expressions intended to convey the bereaved family's grief while supplying practical details about the funeral service (typically including the venue, time, and date of the ceremony, as well as the cemetery where the deceased will be, or has been, buried).

Interactional metadiscourse markers are linguistic structures that draw readers into the text and allow authors to convey their feelings and thoughts (Hyland^[20]). The frequency of interactional metadiscourse markers in Turkish is higher than in English, mirroring the pattern observed for interactive markers. As with the other dimension of metadiscourse, these findings may reflect sociocultural influences on language. Although the results were normalized to occurrences per 1000 words, the smaller size of the Turkish dataset relative to the English one constrains the scope of discussion on this point. The rank order of interactional markers used in death notices from most to least frequent (attitude markers, self-mentions, engagement markers, boosters, and hedges) aligns with Al-Subhi's^[67] findings on advertising discourse and, given the characteristics of both genres, indicates that the way notices address recipients shares genre-based features with the interactional dimension of advertisements.

In both English and Turkish, attitude markers are the most common interactional devices. Since they express the writer's emotional stance toward the propositions, their prominence in death notices is unsurprising. In both sets of linguistic data, the high frequency of attitude markers can be explained as a genre-specific characteristic of death notices by the fact that the person placing the notice both frequently uses adjectives about the situation or the deceased to express their sorrow and, in seeking to convey the facts of death with sensitivity, presents them to the reader through euphemism. Although two different languages or cultures are in question, death notices display shared genre-specific features with respect to their defining functions.

In Turkish, the second most frequent interactional marker is the self-mentions. Through this device, announcers explicitly encode themselves in the text to issue an invitation or provide information (Hyland^[20]). Although self-mentions

are frequent in Turkish, they are the least common interactional markers in English, a discrepancy that may stem from cultural differences. In Turkish notices, the announcer often includes themselves not only to honour the deceased but also to encourage a larger turnout because they are personally known. Within Turkish religious teaching and cultural tradition, a crowded funeral, with many participants accompanying the deceased and attending the funeral prayer, is valued because it facilitates the ritual of mutual forgiveness (Tr. “helallik”). In Turkish and Islamic culture, helallik involves relinquishing one’s claims on others and forgiving them, while receiving the same in return; thus, the deceased will not be held accountable for interpersonal transgressions when facing the Creator. Consequently, inviting people to the funeral is one motive for issuing a death notice. The prominence of self-mentions immediately after attitude markers is therefore interpreted in light of these religious and cultural considerations.

In Turkish death notices, engagement markers constitute the third most frequent interactional metadiscourse device. Their relatively high frequency reflects the texts’ dual purpose of informing readers about the funeral arrangements and encouraging their attendance. In English death notices, engagement markers rank second, after attitude markers, again underscoring the invitational function of the genre. In death notices, the frequencies of self-mention and engagement markers are high relative to the other interactional resources; by contrast, studies of academic prose (García-Calvo^[68]; Pourmohammadi & Kuhl^[69]; Karimi et al.^[70]; Livingstone^[71]; Musa et al.^[72]; Şen^[52]; Gong et al.^[73]; Ahmadi^[74]; Soyşekerci^[42]) place self-mentions and engagement markers among the least frequent interactional resources, and research on narratives (Al-jazrawi & Al-jazrawi^[44,45]; Hamad & Kareem^[66]; Soyşekerci^[42]) reports similarly low frequencies for self-mentions; narrative studies (Herriman^[65]; Al-jazrawi & Al-jazrawi^[44,45]; Hamad & Kareem^[66]; Soyşekerci^[42]) likewise reports low frequencies for self-mentions.

Boosters in Turkish death notices generally reinforce attitude markers, enabling announcers to convey their grief with greater force and to enhance the illocutionary strength of the propositions. No hedges appear in Turkish death notices, whereas English notices contain some. Because hedges limit the writer’s commitment and shift responsibility from direct

persuasion to cautious presentation (Hyland^[20]), their use in English may reflect cultural norms in which funeral attendance is less obligatory than in Turkey, where religious and cultural practices place stronger expectations on communal participation.

When the findings of the study are considered as a whole, firstly, the English dataset was larger than the Turkish dataset, but this asymmetry itself may be interpreted as culturally meaningful, as it highlights differences in publication practices and societal traditions regarding death notices. Thus, rather than undermining the validity of the comparison, the dataset composition provides additional insights into the cross-cultural variation of death notice discourse. In recent years, death notices in Turkey have been predominantly given through social media accounts or by announcements in small settlements. In contrast, expensive newspaper advertisements appear to be preferred by individuals with higher economic status or prominent celebrities or families in society. Secondly, the corpus was restricted to three weeks (January 1st–20th, 2025) to ensure synchronic comparability between English and Turkish texts. While this scope inevitably limits representativeness and cautions against broad generalizations, the present study is intended as an exploratory analysis. The findings, therefore, should be seen as preliminary insights that lay the groundwork for future research with broader and diachronic datasets. Thirdly, although the frequency ranking from most to least of interactive metadiscourse markers in Turkish and English death notices is similar, there are differences in the rankings of interactional markers. This situation can be attributed to differences in culture and in the typological structures of the languages; nevertheless, when the genre is taken as the frame of analysis, many similarities remain. In this context, the study contributes to the literature by offering a cross-cultural comparative analysis—within a metadiscourse framework—of a genre that has not previously been examined in this way.

6. Conclusions and Suggestions

This study, which compared the use of metadiscourse markers in English and Turkish newspaper death notices, examined not only the distribution of interactive and interactional markers but also demonstrated how these linguistic

choices reflect broader cultural practices of memorialization. Situating the analysis within the scope of genre studies and intercultural discourse analysis, the findings highlight that death notice discourse functions as both a conventionalized textual form and a culturally embedded practice.

While these findings offer valuable insights, the study is not without limitations. The dataset covers only a short three-week period (January 1–20, 2025), and there is a notable imbalance between the English and Turkish corpora. These constraints, while methodologically justified, limit the representativeness of the results and warrant caution against broad generalizations. Considering these limitations and the fact that this study is the first of its kind in the field (to the best of our knowledge), the study should be seen as exploratory, laying the groundwork for further research.

Future investigations could extend the analysis to larger and more balanced datasets, as well as diachronic corpora, to examine how death notice discourse evolves over time. Comparative research across additional cultural contexts would also test the robustness and transferability of the observed patterns. Such studies would not only refine our understanding of metadiscourse in death notices but also deepen insights into the interaction between genre, culture, and discourse practices.

In light of these determinations, the following conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made:

1. In both languages, interactive metadiscourse markers were used more frequently than interactional markers. This result aligns with the primary function of death notices: To inform readers about the death and to clearly invite them to the funeral. Further research is needed to determine whether this pattern also applies to death notices written in other languages.
2. Although the study analyzed death notices from two different cultural contexts, the rank order of interactive markers was found to be similar in both cultures as stated above. This can primarily be attributed to the fact that death notices constitute a distinct textual genre. However, the distribution of interactional markers, which reflect how the writer influences the reader, was not similar across the two languages. For example, hedges were not used at all in Turkish. This indicates that genre-based explanations alone may not fully account for such differences. Therefore, it is suggested

that these textual choices are also shaped by the sociological structures of the cultures, and further comparative studies involving other language families and larger corpora are recommended.

3. In both Turkish and English death notices, attitude markers were the most frequently used type of interactional metadiscourse marker. In this context, no negative characterizations of the deceased were observed in either language; instead, the focus was placed on the positive qualities of the deceased, and grief over their passing was explicitly expressed.
4. In both languages, euphemistic language was used to refer to the event of death. This suggests that the discourse features of death notice writing reflect a cross-cultural approach, regardless of linguistic or cultural differences.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; methodology, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; software, G.S.; validation, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; formal analysis, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; investigation, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; resources, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; data curation, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; writing—original draft preparation, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; writing—review and editing, D.F., E.A., and G.S.; visualization, D.F.; supervision, D.F.; project administration, D.F.; funding acquisition, D.F. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to the exclusive use of publicly available obituary data from Turkish and UK-based online newspapers (e.g., *Hürriyet*, *The Times*). Although the death notices contained personal information such as names, ages, and places of death, no attempt was made to identify or contact individuals. The data were analyzed solely within the framework of discourse analysis, and the study complied with relevant data protection regulations in both jurisdictions.

Informed Consent Statement

Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to the exclusive use of publicly available obituary data from Turkish and UK-based online newspapers (e.g., *Hürriyet*, *The Times*). Although the death notices contained personal information such as names, ages, and places of death, no attempt was made to identify or contact individuals. The data were analyzed solely within the framework of discourse analysis, and the study complied with relevant data protection regulations in both jurisdictions.

Data Availability Statement

This research article uses third party source data from English and Turkish newspapers. The links of the data of these newspapers are listed below:

English

The Telegraph Announcements: <https://announcements.telegraph.co.uk/marketplace/category/deaths>

The Times Announcements: <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/births-marriages-and-deaths-b06slc6zv>

Turkish

Hürriyet Newspaper: <http://hurriyet.com.tr>

Sabah Newspaper: <http://sabah.com.tr>

Sözcü Newspaper: <http://sozcu.com.tr>

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Hançerlioğlu, O., 1975. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Remzi Kitabevi: İstanbul, Türkiye. (in Turkish)
- [2] Örnek, S.V., 1971. *Death in Anatolian Folklore*. DTCF Yayınları: Ankara, Türkiye. (in Turkish)
- [3] Özgen, M., 2025. Death perception in Anatolian culture: Good and bad death from sociological and folkloric perspective. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*. 24(1), 120–140. (in Turkish)
- [4] Feifel, H., 1959. Attitudes toward death in some normal and mentally ill populations. In *The Meaning of Death*. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA. pp. 114–130.
- [5] Hume, J., 2000. *Obituaries in American Culture*. University Press of Mississippi: Jackson, MS, USA.
- [6] Ergin, M., 2010. Taking it to the grave: Gender, cultural capital and ethnicity in Turkish death announcements. *Journal of Death and Dying*. 60(2), 175–197.
- [7] Ergin, M., 2023. Eternal life as privilege: Cultural boundaries and social stratification in death announcements (1950–2010). *Death Studies*. 47(4), 461–475. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2022.2089778>
- [8] Al-Ali, M.N., 2005. Communicating messages of solidarity, promotion, and pride in death announcements genre in Jordanian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*. 16(1), 5–31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926505048228>
- [9] Swales, J., 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [10] Bhatia, V.K., 1993. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. Longman: London, UK.
- [11] Hyland, K., 2009. *Academic Discourse: English in A Global Context*. Continuum: London, UK.
- [12] Uzun, L., 2006. Scientific discourse and its characteristics. In: Karakütük, K. (Ed.). *Proceedings of the 1st National Congress of Periodical Publishing in Social Sciences*. pp. 133–140. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Inayet-Aydin/publication/321361249_Sosyal_Bilimlerde_Arastirmadan_Yayina_Etik_Degerler/links/5a1e9f350f7e9b9d5efff08/Sosyal-Bilimlerde-Arastirmadan-Yayina-Etik-Degerler.pdf (cited 25 August 2025). (in Turkish)
- [13] Altun, M.E., 2024. A semiotic analysis of English obituaries. *Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 28, 86–102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29029/busbed.1481811> (in Turkish)
- [14] Ergin, M., 2012. Religiosity and the construction of death in Turkish death announcements, 1970–2009. *Death Studies*. 36(3), 270–291. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2011.553339>
- [15] Borde, S., 2015. Late Modern English death notices: Transformations of a traditional lay audience. In: Bös, B., Kornexl, L. (Eds.). *Changing Genre Conventions in Historical English News Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam, Netherlands. pp. 103–134.
- [16] Aliakbari, M., Tarlani-Aliabadi, H., 2016. Communicating sociocultural norms and social and religious practices in Iranian death notices. *Social Semiotics*. 26(2), 185–207.
- [17] Facchinetti, R., 2016. Birte Bös and Lucia Kornexl (eds.), *Changing Genre Conventions in Historical English News Discourse* (Advances in Historical Linguistics 5). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015. Pp. xiv + 254. ISBN 9789027200846. *English Language & Linguistics*. 20(2), 353–357. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674316000149>
- [18] Landert, D., 2017. Review of Birte Bös and Lucia Kornexl (eds.). *Changing Genre Conventions in Histor-*

- ical English News Discourse. *Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics* 5. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins, 2015, xv + 254 pp., € 99.00/\$ 149.00. *Anglia: Journal of English Philology*. 135(2), 358–362. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2017-0029>
- [19] Laurila, A., 2020. The development of death notices in America: A case study of the New York Times from 1852 to 2002 [Master's thesis]. University of Turku: Turku, Finland.
- [20] Hyland, K., 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Bloomsbury Publishing: London, UK.
- [21] Hyland, K., 1998. Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 30, 437–455.
- [22] Lautamatti, L., 1978. Observations on the development of the topic in simplified discourse. *AFinLAN Vuosikirja*. 71–104. Available from: <https://journal.fi/afinlan/article/view/57428>
- [23] Williams, J.M., 1989. *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace*, 3rd ed. Scott Foresman: Glenview, IL, USA.
- [24] Crismore, A., 1983. *Metadiscourse: What is it and how is it used in school and non-school social science texts*. University of Illinois: Urbana, IL, USA.
- [25] Crismore, A., 1989. *Talking with Readers: Metadiscourse as Rhetorical Act*. Peter Lang: New York, NY, USA.
- [26] Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., Steffensen, M., 1993. Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*. 10, 39–71.
- [27] Vande Kopple, W.J., 1985. Some explanatory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*. 36(1), 82–93.
- [28] Hyland, K., Tse, P., 2004. Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*. 25(2), 156–177.
- [29] Ädel, A., 2006. *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- [30] Salahshour, F., 2017. A 'thick description' genre analysis of death announcement notices. *Science*. 21(4), 99–110.
- [31] Murrell, A.J., Jamie, K., Penfold-Mounce, R., 2023. 'It was the easiest way to kind of announce it': Exploring death announcements on social media through a dramaturgical lens. *Mortality*. 28(3), 411–428.
- [32] Hyland, K., 2005. Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*. 7(2), 173–192.
- [33] Compulang, 2002. *WordPilot (Version 1.6)*. Compulang: Hong Kong, China.
- [34] Bondi, M., 1999. *English Across Genres: Language Variation in the Discourse of Economics*. Edizioni Il Fiorino: Modena, Italy.
- [35] Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., et al., 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman: London, UK.
- [36] Hyland, K., 1999. Disciplinary discourses: Writer stance in research articles. In: Candlin, C., Hyland, K. (Eds.). *Writing: Texts, Processes and Practices*. Longman: London, UK. pp. 99–121.
- [37] Hyland, K., 2000. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Longman: London, UK.
- [38] Kuhi, D., Mojood, M., Branch, M., et al., 2012. A contrastive study of metadiscourse in English and Persian editorials. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 5(1), 137–162.
- [39] Zali, M.M., Mohamad, R., Setia, R., et al., 2020. Comparisons of interactive and interactional metadiscourse among undergraduates. *Asian Journal of University Education*. 16(4), 21–30.
- [40] Binmahboob, T., 2022. The use of metadiscourse by Saudi and British authors: A focus on applied linguistics discipline. *English Language Teaching*. 15(2), 78–89.
- [41] Kirişçi, D.I., Duruk, E., 2022. A comparative study of metadiscourse markers in the abstract sections of research articles written by Turkish and English researchers. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*. 10(4), 101–114.
- [42] Soyşekerci, G., 2023. The appearance of metadiscourse markers in different text types [PhD thesis]. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü: İzmir, Türkiye. (in Turkish)
- [43] Sadeghi, K., Esmaili, S., 2012. Frequency of textual metadiscourse resources (MTRs) in two original and simplified novels. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 3(4), 1–10.
- [44] Al-Jazrawi, D.A., Al-Jazrawi, Z.A., 2019. The use of meta-discourse: An analysis of interactive and interactional markers in English short stories as a type of literary genre. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*. 8(3), 66–77.
- [45] Al-Jazrawi, D., Al-Jazrawi, Z., 2021. Metadiscourse as a way of achieving persuasion in literary criticism texts. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*. 21(3), 1–15.
- [46] İşeri, K., Aydın-Öztürk, E., Soyşekerci, G., 2019. Metadiscourse markers in essay type texts. In: İşeri, K., Çapan Tekin, S., Aydın-Öztürk, E., et al. (Eds.). *Current Debates in Linguistics*. Dilbilim Derneği: Ankara, Türkiye. pp. 99–110. (in Turkish)
- [47] Bondi, M., 2020. *Academics online: Code glosses across research genres and public communication*. In: Gotti, M., Mack, S., Sala, M. (Eds.). *Scholarly Pathways: Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Exchange in Academia*. Peter Lang: Bern, Switzerland. pp. 57–82.
- [48] Khedri, M., Heng, C.S., Ebrahimi, S.F., 2013. An explo-

- ration of interactive metadiscourse markers in academic research article abstracts in two disciplines. *Discourse Studies*. 15(3), 319–331.
- [49] Özdemir, N.O., Longo, B., 2014. Metadiscourse use in thesis abstracts: A cross-cultural study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 141, 59–63.
- [50] Wang, L., Zhang, Y., 2016. A study of metadiscourse features in English news reports. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*. 5(6), 75–83.
- [51] Mansouri, S., Najafabadi, M.M., Boroujeni, S.S., 2016. Metadiscourse in research article abstracts: A cross-lingual and disciplinary investigation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*. 3(4), 296–307.
- [52] Şen, E., 2019. Examining metadiscourse markers in scientific article abstracts [PhD thesis]. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü: İzmir, Türkiye. (in Turkish)
- [53] Dağ-Tarcan, Ö., 2017. Interactive metadiscourse markers in Turkish scientific texts. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 8(2), 176–194. (in Turkish)
- [54] Şen, E., 2020. “I” and “We” in article abstracts: A metadiscourse analysis. *International Journal of Language Academy*. 8(1), 62–72. (in Turkish)
- [55] Soyşekerci, G., Öztürk, E.A., İşeri, K., 2022. Metadiscourse markers in the conclusion sections of graduate theses. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Türkoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 7(2), 766–794. (in Turkish)
- [56] Güçlü, R., 2025. The use of metadiscourse markers in L2 Turkish opinion texts by native Albanian students. *Uluslararası Türkçe Öğretimi Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 5(2), 288–316.
- [57] Ahangari, S., Kazemi, M., 2014. A content analysis of ‘Alice in Wonderland’ regarding metadiscourse elements. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*. 3(3), 10–18.
- [58] Esmaili, S., 2020. Interactional metadiscourse resources in *Oliver Twist*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 10(6), 78–89.
- [59] Hidayah, T.R.N.I., 2020. Metadiscourse analysis on Hamilton Wright Mabie’s fairy tales [PhD thesis]. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim: Malang, Indonesia.
- [60] Rahmawati, Y.N., 2020. Interactive metadiscourse markers in horror story podcast [PhD thesis]. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim: Malang, Indonesia.
- [61] Putri, A.N., Hastomo, T., Farhan, M., et al., 2023. A study of interaction and interactive metadiscourse on Ukraine–Russia conflict news articles. *Journal of English Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literatures (JETALL)*. 6(1), 89–100.
- [62] Khajavy, G.H., Asadpour, S.F., Yousefi, A., 2012. A comparative analysis of interactive metadiscourse features in discussion sections of research articles written in English and Persian. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 4(2), 147–159.
- [63] Ghahremani-Mina, K., Biriya, R., 2017. Exploring interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in discussion sections of social and medical science articles. *International Journal of Research in English Education*. 2(4), 11–29.
- [64] Farahani, M.V., Mohemmed, A.A., 2018. Metadiscourse in academic vs. nonacademic writing: A comparative corpus-driven inquiry. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov, Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies*. 11(2), 145–166.
- [65] Herriman, J., 2014. Metadiscourse in English and Swedish non-fiction texts and their translations. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*. 13(1), 1–32.
- [66] Hamad, Z.H., Kareem, A.P.R.D., 2024. Investigation of the subtypes of transition markers of metadiscourse in Nathaniel Hawthorne’s simplified version *The Scarlet Letter*. *The Islamic University College Journal*. 79(2), 70–81.
- [67] Al-Subhi, A.S., 2022. Metadiscourse in online advertising: Exploring linguistic and visual metadiscourse in social media advertisements. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 187, 24–40.
- [68] García-Calvo, J., 2002. Uses of metadiscourse in a research abstract for scientific events. *Revista Letras*. 57, 195–209.
- [69] Pourmohammadi, M., Kuhi, D.D., 2016. A comparative analysis of self-mentions in applied linguistics PhD dissertations written by native and nonnative English writers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*. 4(1), 109–124.
- [70] Karimi, K., Maleki, M., Farnia, M., 2017. Metadiscourse markers in the abstract sections of Persian and English law articles. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*. 5(18), 69–83.
- [71] Livingstone, K.A., 2019. Examining the use of metadiscourse markers in academic writing. *International Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics*. 5(3), 244–254.
- [72] Musa, A., Hussin, S., Ho, I.A., 2019. Interaction in academic L2 writing: An analysis of interactional metadiscourse strategies in applied linguistics research articles. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. 25 (3), 16–32. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2503-02>
- [73] Gong, H., Liu, L., Cao, F., 2023. A cross-linguistic study of interactional metadiscourse in English and Chinese research articles by the same Chinese scholars. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*. 22(6), 542–558.
- [74] Ahmadi, L., 2022. Interactional metadiscourse markers in scientific texts (based on research articles written by native and non-native speakers). *Science Journal of Volgograd State University: Linguistics*. 21(4), 99–110.